

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-11, and 13-27 are pending in the present case. Claims 1, 3, 8-11, and 13-20 are amended herein. Claims 21-27 are new. Claims 7 and 12 stand cancelled. Applicant respectfully requests continuing examination in view of the above amendments to the present application, and the arguments set forth below. No new matter is added herein.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 USC 112

Claims 1, 14 and 18 are rejected under 35 USC 112 (¶2). Claims 1, 14 and 18 are amended herein to point out with particularity and to claim with distinction their recited subject matter. As amended herein, Claim 1 reads as shown below, with underlining added for emphasis herein.

1. A method of sending an electronic message comprising:
 - a) examining syntactic content of said electronic message;
 - b) comparing said syntactic content to a keyword database for a syntactic match between said syntactic content and one or more keywords stored in said keyword database;
 - c) examining an addressed destination of said message to determine an identity of an intended addressee;
 - d) comparing said identity of said intended addressee to an addressee database for an address-based match between said identity and one or more addressees stored in said addressee database;
 - e) provided that said message does not have an attachment, alerting a sender of said message that said electronic message does not have an attachment, based on one or more of said syntactic match and said address-based match: and
 - f) automatically updating one or more of said keyword database, based on said syntactic match, and

said addressee database, based on said address-based match wherein, provided that said attachment is attached to said message a frequency of one or more of their respective keyword and address-based correlations is increased by one and, provided that said attachment is not attached to said message, a frequency one or more of their respective keyword and address-based correlations is decreased by one.

Claims 14 and 18 are amended in similar fashions, as shown in the discussion below (relating to 35 USC 103). Applicants respectfully assert that, as amended herein, Claims 1, 14 and 18 comply with 35 USC 112.

35 USC 103

CLAIMS 1-20 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over US Patent No. 6,073,133 to Chrabaszc (hereinafter Chrabaszc) in view of US Patent No. 5,850,156 to Meister, et al. (hereinafter Meister). Applicants has reviewed the references cited and respectfully assert that they do not suggest the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-6, 8-11, and 13-20 (or those recited in new Claims 21-27) for the rationale set forth below.

Applicants respectfully note that Claims 2 and 7 stand cancelled. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the instant rejections of Claims 2 and 7 under 35 USC 103(a) are moot.

As Applicants understand the reference, Chrabaszc teaches an email attachment verifier. However, Applicants find no teaching or suggestion within Chrabaszc directed towards automatically updating a keyword database, based on a syntactic match, and/or an addressee database, based on an address-based match, as claimed.

For instance, the cited reference does not teach the claimed updating provided that an attachment is attached to an electronic message before or upon an alert that no attachment was attached, that a frequency of their respective keyword and/or address-based correlations has increased by one, and/or provided that an attachment is not attached to the message upon the alert, that a frequency of their respective keyword and/or address-based correlations has decreased by one, as recited in Claim 1. Claims 14 and 18 each recite related subject matter, and are set forth below.

14. A method of sending an electronic message comprising:

a) examining content of said an electronic message for one or more selected keywords therein, said selected keywords being of a keyword database of keywords associated with messages that frequently have attachments sent therewith;

b) provided said electronic message does not already have an attachment associated therewith, alerting a user that said electronic message does not have an attachment associated therewith provided one of said selected keywords is located within said electronic message;

c) upon said b), provided that said user sends said electronic message without an attachment, updating said keyword database wherein a correlation of sending electronic messages having said one or more keywords with attachments is decreased by one;

d) upon said b) provided that said user attaches an attachment, updating said keyword database wherein a correlation of sending electronic messages having said one or more keywords with attachments is increased by one; and

e) provided that said electronic message does have an attachment associated therewith, updating said keyword database wherein a correlation of sending electronic messages having said one or more keywords with attachments is increased by one.

18. A method of sending an electronic message comprising:

a) examining an addressed recipient of said an electronic message against selected identifications, said selected identifications being of an address-based database of identifications that comprise recipients of messages that frequently have attachments sent therewith;

b) provided that said electronic message does not already have an attachment associated therewith, alerting a user that said electronic message does not have an attachment associated therewith provided one of said selected identifications is said recipient of said electronic message;

c) upon said b), provided that said user sends said electronic message without an attachment, updating said address-based database that a correlation of sending electronic messages to said addressed recipient with attachments has decreased by one;

d) upon said b), provided that said user attaches said attachment, updating said address-based database that said correlation of sending electronic messages to said addressed recipient is increased by one; and

e) provided that said electronic message does have an attachment associated therewith, updating said address-based database that said correlation of sending electronic messages to said addressed recipient is increased by one.

The cited reference does not teach or suggest automatically updating a keyword database, based on a syntactic match, and/or an addressee database, based on an address-based match provided that an attachment is attached to an electronic message before or upon an alert that no attachment was attached, that a frequency of their respective keyword and/or address-based correlations has increased by one, and/or provided that an attachment is not attached to the message upon the alert, that a frequency of their respective keyword and/or address-based correlations has decreased by one, as recited in Claims 1, 14 and 18. The embodiments recited herein are thus distinct from, and have unique advantages over the cited reference.

For instance, such automatic updating allows the respective databases to adjust frequencies of correlation of address-based and/or syntactic matches based upon each electronic message sent. This provides the benefit of a self-learning modality, which allows users to be alerted, prompted, etc. in relation to attachments for messages with greater accuracy and/or precision than possible in previous messages. This has the further benefit of reducing inconvenience and annoyance for users due to "false positives" or attachment-related alerts to the user that are based on keywords and/or addressee identifications with weakened correlations to the frequency of sending electronic messages with attachments.

Moreover, such self-learning and related advantages, benefits, etc. of embodiments recited in Claims 1, 14 and 18 herein go far beyond simply automating a manual process of adding or removing keywords to a keyword database, as taught by Chrabaszcz (Id. at c. 4, ll. 35-58).

Notwithstanding the Examiner's official notice (instant OA at 4, ¶ 4) "that automating an activity to replace manual activity is well known in the art," Applicants respectfully make the following assertions:

- (1) The automatic database updating modalities recited herein are not necessarily related to database entries a user would or could manually make.
- (2) The automatic database updating modalities recited herein far exceed in scope and effect any mere automating of manual database entry modalities.
- (3) The automatic database updating modalities recited herein allow self-learning, wherein electronic systems sending the messages automatically update

their databases to respond with greater accuracy and precision in subsequent messages.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the email attachment verifier taught by Chrabaszcz differs from embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 1-6, 8-11, and 13-20 (and new Claims 21-27).

In fact, Chrabaszcz teaches that a "[u]ser may modify, add and delete keywords/phrases, based on an initial configuration provided with the attachment verifier at the time of its installation." Chrabaszcz, Col. 4, ll. 47-50, underlining added for emphasis. Thus, while Chrabaszcz's database of key words/phrases may be modified, a user must take a positive manual action to do so.

Applicants respectfully assert that, in expressly so teaching, Chrabaszcz effectively teaches away from the embodiments recited in Claims 1 and 14, wherein such a database is automatically updated as recited herein. Further, in expressly limiting its teaching to a database of keyword/phrases (Id.), Chrabaszcz fails to teach the address-based database recited herein and in fact, expressly teaches away therefrom. Applicants have reviewed the Meister reference and respectfully asserts that nothing therein cures these defects of Chrabaszcz.

As Applicants understand the reference, Meister's teachings are "directed to a system that alerts or warns a user of an electronic mail system as to the addressees of a message before the message is sent, after the user indicates that the message is to be sent, and allows the sender to revise the list of addressees or cancel the sending entirely." Meister, Col. 1, ll. 11-15. However, Applicants find no teaching or suggestion therein directed towards any database of key words and phrases

(e.g., such as the first database recited in Claim 1 herein). Applicants also find no teaching or suggestion in Meister directed towards automatically updating its addressee database, as recited herein.

Meister expressly lists the objects of the invention taught therein as providing an e-mail system that "alert[s] a user to the addressees of an e-mail message before it is sent," "alert[s] a user when an unauthorized e-mail message is being sent," "allow[s] a user to modify [i.e., *Manually*] a list of addressees of an email message before the message is sent and after the addressee list is originally created," and "determine[s] whether an addressee's address is properly entered and to alert the user in the case of potentially undeliverable message prior to sending." Id. at Col. 2, ll. 7-19, underlining added for emphasis.

Meister then teaches that "[t]he sender can then verify that the addresses are correct or change or delete those on the list," and "allows the user to delete [an] unauthorized message." Id. at ll. 23-26. Thus, Meister's teachings are expressly "directed to" (Id. at Col. 1, l. 9) alerting a user about the correctness of addressees' addresses in email messages and to a user taking a positive action to correct same, where an address is incorrect. While Meister teaches some automatic action, such action therein is expressly limited to comparing addresses, as typed, with listed addresses.

Applicants respectfully assert that, in expressly limiting automatic action therein to address checking, Meister effectively teaches away from the embodiments recited in Claims 1, 14 and 18, which relate to attachment confirmation.

Moreover, where a system such as taught by Meister does alert a user to an incorrect address, the address alerted to therein is in the message address field and a positive manual user action is required to correct it. Applicants thus also respectfully assert that, in teaching correction of the address in the message address field, Meister teaches away from the embodiments recited in Claims 1, 14, and 18, relating to updating an address database, and that in requiring positive manual user action to change the address, Meister further teaches away from these embodiments, which are automatic. Applicants find nothing in Chrabaszcz that cures these defects of Meister.

Applicants find no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to modify the teachings in either Chrabaszcz or Meister, jointly or severally, to achieve verification of attachment for an electronic message with automatic updating of key word and address databases, as claimed herein. Further, as discussed above, both references expressly teach away from such embodiments. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-6, 8-11, and 13-20 (and new Claims 21-27) are allowable over Chrabaszcz in view of Meister under 35 USC 103(a).

CONCLUSION

By the rationale stated above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1, 14 and 18 are allowable under 35 USC 112 and that Claims 1-6, 8-11, and 13-27 are allowable under 35 USC 103(a). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn and that Claims 1-6, 8-11, and 13-27 be allowed.

Please charge our deposit account No. 23-0085, for any unpaid fees.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: April 27, 2005



Lawrence R. Goerke
Reg. No. 45,927

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP
Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
Tel.: (408) 938-9060
Fax: (408) 938-9069